

Application No. 10/608,358
Amendment dated December 11, 2007
Response to Office Action of September 11, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 42P22425
Examiner TRAN, Con P.
TC/A.U. 2615

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 14, 16, 17 and 29 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Thus, claims 1-29 are pending.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 16 and 17 were objected to for informalities. The identified informalities have been corrected. Accordingly, Applicants request that the claim objections be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 14, 24 and 25 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,110,799 issued to Willins, et al. (*Willins*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1, 14, 24 and 25 are not anticipated by *Willins*.

Claim 1 recites detection of a stereo event announcement device. *Willins* does not disclose the equivalent of a stereo event announcement device. Further, claims 1 and 14 recite management of Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) calls. *Willins* does not disclose management of VoIP calls. Therefore, *Willins* cannot anticipate the invention as recited in claims 1 and 14.

Claims 24 and 25 depend from claim 14. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 24 and 25 are not anticipated by *Willins* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Application No. 10/608,358
Amendment dated December 11, 2007
Response to Office Action of September 11, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 42P22425
Examiner TRAN, Con P.
TC/A.U. 2615

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – CLAIMS 2, 15 AND 23

Claims 2, 15 and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,350,150 issued to DeLadurantaye (*DeLadurantaye*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 2, 15 and 23 are not rendered obvious by *Willins* and *DeLadurantaye*.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and claim 23 depends from claim 15. *DeLadurantaye* is cited to teach a headset receptacle jack. See Office Action at page 4. However, whether or not *DeLadurantaye* discloses the headset receptacle jack, *DeLadurantaye* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Willins* and *DeLadurantaye* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 2, 15 and 23.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – CLAIMS 3, 4, 6, 16, 17 AND 19

Claims 3, 4, 6, 16, 17 and 19 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* and *DeLadurantaye* in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0196249 of Roberts (*Roberts*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 3, 4, 6, 16, 17 and 19 are not rendered obvious by *Willins*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts*.

Claims 3, 4 and 6 depend from claim 1. Claims 16, 17 and 19 depend from claim 14. As discussed above, *Willins* and *DeLadurantaye* do not teach or suggest the invention as recited in the claims discussed above. *Roberts* is cited to teach a stereo jack. However, whether or not *Roberts* discloses the stereo jack, *Roberts* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins* and *DeLadurantaye* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of

Application No. 10/608,358
Amendment dated December 11, 2007
Response to Office Action of September 11, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 42P22425
Examiner TRAN, Con P.
TC/A.U. 2615

Willins, DeLadurantaye and *Roberts* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 3, 4, 6, 16, 17 and 19.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – CLAIMS 5 AND 18

Claims 5 and 18 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* in view of *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,889,843 issued to *Singer, et al. (Singer)*. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 5 and 18 are not rendered obvious by *Willins, DeLadurantaye, Roberts* and *Singer*.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 18 depends from claim 14. As discussed above, *Willins, DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* do not teach or suggest the invention as recited in the claims discussed above. *Singer* is cited to teach in-ear headphones. See Office Action at page 10. However, whether or not *Singer* discloses the in-ear headphones, *Singer* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins, DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Willins, DeLadurantaye, Roberts* and *Singer* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 5 and 18.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – CLAIMS 7 AND 20

Claims 7 and 20 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* and *DeLadurantaye* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,653,934 issued to *Pan, et al. (Pan)*. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 20 are not rendered obvious by *Willins, DeLadurantaye* and *Pan*.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and claim 20 depends from claim 14. As discussed above, *Willins* and *DeLadurantaye* do not teach or suggest the invention as recited in the claims discussed above. *Pan* is cited to teach buzzers. See Office Action at page 12.

Application No. 10/608,358
Amendment dated December 11, 2007
Response to Office Action of September 11, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 42P22425
Examiner TRAN, Con P.
TC/A.U. 2615

However, whether or not *Pan* discloses the buzzers, *Pan* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins* and *DeLadurantaye* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Willins*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Pan* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 7 and 20.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – CLAIMS 8 AND 21

Claims 8 and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* in view of *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* and further in view of *Pan*. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 8 and 21 are not rendered obvious by *Willins*, *DeLadurantaye*, *Roberts* and *Pan*.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and claim 21 depends from claim 14. As discussed above, *Willins*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* do not teach or suggest the invention as recited in the claims discussed above. *Pan* is cited to teach buzzers. See Office Action at page 13. However, whether or not *Pan* discloses the buzzers, *Pan* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Willins*, *DeLadurantaye*, *Roberts* and *Pan* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 8 and 21.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – CLAIMS 9 AND 22

Claims 9 and 22 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* in view of *DeLadurantaye*, *Roberts*, *Singer* and *Pan*. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 9 and 22 are not rendered obvious by *Willins*, *DeLadurantaye*, *Roberts*, *Singer* and *Pan*.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1 and claim 22 depends from claim 14. As discussed above, *Willins*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* do not teach or suggest the invention as

Application No. 10/608,358
Amendment dated December 11, 2007
Response to Office Action of September 11, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 42P22425
Examiner TRAN, Con P.
TC/A.U. 2615

recited in the claims discussed above. *Pan* is cited to teach buzzers. See Office Action at page 17. However, whether or not *Pan* discloses the buzzers, *Pan* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Willins*, *DeLadurantaye*, *Roberts* and *Pan* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 9 and 22.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – CLAIMS 26 AND 27

Claims 26 and 27 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* in view of *Pan*. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 26 and 27 are not rendered obvious by *Willins* and *Pan*.

Claims 26 and 27 depend from claim 14. *Pan* is cited to teach buzzers. See Office Action at page 12. However, whether or not *Pan* discloses the buzzers, *Pan* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Willins* and *Pan* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 26 and 27.

CLAIM REJECTION – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – CLAIM 29

Claim 29 was rejected as being unpatentable over *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts*. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 26 and 27 are not rendered obvious by *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts*.

Claim 29 recites:

a second event announcement element connected to the second channel of the stereo jack wherein a signal is provided to the first event announcement element that is separate from a signal provided to the second event announcement element, the signal provided to the first event announcement element corresponds to receipt of a Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) call.

Application No. 10/608,358
Amendment dated December 11, 2007
Response to Office Action of September 11, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 42P22425
Examiner TRAN, Con P.
TC/A.U. 2615

Thus, Applicants claim providing a signal in response to a VoIP call.

Neither *DeLadurantaye* nor *Roberts* discloses providing a signal in response to a VoIP call. Therefore, even if *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* are properly combined, the resulting combination does not result in the invention as claimed in claim 29.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-29 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: December 11, 2007

/Paul A. Mendonsa/
Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778